Siskiyou County MHSA
PEI Contractor Master Analysis

Version 3 — Full Evidentiary Record

BOS Agenda Archive Research | FY 21/22 through FY 23/24
Compiled: February 2026

Section 1: Contractor Abbreviation Key

The following contractors were identified across three fiscal years of MHSA Prevention and Early Intervention (PEI) program contracting.

Code	Full Name	Program Focus / Notes
SCRC	Siskiyou Community Resource Collaborative	FRC umbrella, 7 community centers, prevention/outreach
HCCA	Happy Camp Community Action, Inc.	Tribal-adjacent, remote community PEI; uses Center for Healthy Minds curriculum (per Dec 2022 worksheet)
TEACH	T.E.A.C.H., Inc. (Tulelake/ Newell FRC)	Tulelake/Newell area, FRC-based prevention
QVIR	Quartz Valley Indian Community	Tribal contractor, Scott Valley
Etna PAL	Etna Police Activities League	Youth mentoring, Scott Valley
YES	Youth Empowerment Siskiyou	Youth outreach, Yreka-based; outreach to underserved/unserved communities
TMS	Tiny, Mighty, and Strong Corporation	Prevention/EI, Merrill/Malin/Tulelake/Dorris communities (Butte Valley)
Lotus	Lotus Educational Services, Inc.	Mental Health First Aid (MHFA) & Suicide Prevention trainings specifically
Karuk	Karuk Tribe Housing Authority	Tribal outreach, Karuk ancestral territory; tribal-specific PEI
YHS	Yreka Union High School District	School-based PEI, Yreka high schools
SUHSD	Siskiyou Union High School District	School-based PEI, Mt. Shasta area
NVCSS	Northern Valley Catholic Social Services	Six Stones Wellness Center — CSS (Activity 163), NOT PEI; $1.93M, 3-yr contract
Dunamis	Dunamis Wellness, Inc.	School-based (Botvin LifeSkills, CANS/ACES, mentoring); disappeared FY 23/24
Jauregui	Eric Jauregui, MHSA Coordinator	County contact for 2023 RFP; ran procurement process replacing 2022 RFA cohort

Code	Full Name	Program Focus / Notes
Schlieter	Samantha Schlieter, MHSA Coordinator	County contact for 2022 RFA; predecessor coordinator
Bullock	R. (Rose) Bullock	Administrative recipient of all executed contracts; also named as ARER preparer. Hub linking procurement, contract execution, and outcome reporting.

Section 2: Year-by-Year NTE Amount Comparison

NTE = Not To Exceed contract amount. All FY 22/23 amounts are now confirmed from Collard's own BOS agenda worksheets (December 6, 2022 consent agenda). All FY 23/24 NTE amounts confirmed via Exhibit A review or contract Article 4.01. ✓ = confirmed from primary source document.

Contractor	FY 21/22 NTE	FY 22/23 NTE	FY 23/24 NTE	BOS Approval	Change	Key Notes
SCRC	$252,000*	$404,600 ✓	$155,000 ✓	Mar 12, 2024	−62%	9 months late. Worksheet confirms Collard personally submitted both years. Fund 2129/401031/723000/164
HCCA	$60,074 ✓	$103,900 ✓	$115,000 ✓	~Oct/Nov 2023	+11%	Uses Center for Healthy Minds curriculum per Dec 2022 worksheet. 73% increase FY21→FY22/23. Fund 2129/401031/723000/164
TEACH	Unknown	$164,928 ✓	$110,000 ✓	~Sep/Oct 2023	−33%	$54,928 reduction. No documented rationale. Fund 2129/401031/723000/164
YES	Unknown	$112,130 ✓	$60,000 ✓	~Sep/Oct 2023	−46%	$52,130 reduction. Per Dec 2022 worksheet: outreach to underserved/unserved. Fund 2129/401031/723000/164
SCRC						
Etna PAL	Unknown	$94,000 ✓	$30,215 ✓	~Oct/Nov 2023	−68%	$63,785 reduction. Youth mentoring for at-risk youth (school failure/JJ risk per worksheet). Fund 2129/401031/723000/164
QVIR	Unknown	TBD	$50,000 ✓	~Oct/Nov 2023	N/A	Tribal contractor. FY22/23 amount not yet confirmed
YHS	None	$180,700	$300,000 †	Feb 20, 2024 (base)	↑66%	Fund code 2129/401031/723000/164 — same as Dunamis. School-based substitution. 8 months late for base
SUHSD	None	None	$150,000 ✓	~Dec 2023	NEW	New FY23/24 contractor. Same fund code as Dunamis/YHS. School-based
TMS	**Unknown**	**$144,537 ✓**	**NONE**	**N/A**	**GONE**	**Per Dec 2022 worksheet: Merrill/Malin/Tulelake/Dorris PEI. Disappeared. No BOS termination record**

Contractor	FY 21/22 NTE	FY 22/23 NTE	FY 23/24 NTE	BOS Approval	Change	Key Notes
Lotus	**Unknown**	**$77,800 ✓**	**NONE**	**N/A**	**GONE**	**Per Dec 2022 worksheet: MHFA and Suicide Prevention trainings specifically. Disappeared. No BOS termination record**
Karuk	**Unknown**	**$73,395 ✓**	**NONE**	**N/A**	**GONE**	**Per Dec 2022 worksheet: tribal outreach to Karuk tribal members. Disappeared. No BOS termination record**
Dunamis	**$285,000/ yr**	**$285,000 ✓**	**NONE**	**N/A**	**GONE**	**School-based (Botvin LifeSkills evidence-based). Fund code matched YHS/ SUHSD. Disappeared. No BOS termination record. FY21/22 unreported in ARER**
NVCSS	None	None	$1,926,137 ✓	Mar 12, 2024	NEW CSS	Activity code 163/163A — CSS, NOT PEI (164). Six Stones Wellness Center. Approved same day as SCRC PEI contract, 9 months late

**** FY 21/22 SCRC amount from prior meeting; FY 21/22 meeting 405647 not fully accessible.***

† YHS: base $150,000 (Feb 20, 2024) + addendum $150,000 (~Oct 2024) = $300,000 total, extended through FY 24/25.

✓ All FY 22/23 amounts for TMS, Lotus, Karuk, YES, HCCA, Etna PAL confirmed directly from Collard's December 6, 2022 BOS agenda worksheets.

Section 3: Fund Code and School-Based Substitution Analysis

All confirmed FY 23/24 PEI contracts carry identical fund code 2129/401031/723000/164. The school-based allocation within this fund code shows a deliberate vendor substitution pattern across three fiscal years.

Fiscal Year	School-Based Contractors	Combined Amount	Notes
FY 21/22	Dunamis only	$285,000	Botvin LifeSkills, CANS/ ACES, mentoring
FY 22/23	Dunamis + YHS	$285,000 + $180,700 = $465,700	Dunamis school-based; YHS added as second school contractor
FY 23/24	YHS + SUHSD (Dunamis = $0)	$300,000 + $150,000 = $450,000	Dunamis replaced entirely. Net school allocation essentially unchanged (~$450K)

KEY FINDING — Vendor Substitution, Not Budget Reduction

The school-based PEI allocation held constant at approximately $450,000-$465,000 across all three fiscal years. What changed was the vendor: Dunamis (Redding-based private company with evidence-based Botvin LifeSkills curriculum) was replaced by two local school districts (YHS and SUHSD). This was not a budget reduction — it was an active programmatic decision made without a BOS agenda item, without a documented Dunamis performance evaluation, and without public explanation. The fund code pattern makes the substitution directly traceable.

Section 4: Procurement History — 2022 RFA vs. 2023 RFP

4A. The 2022 Request for Applications (RFA)

Released: February 16, 2022 | Contact: Samantha Schlieter, MHSA Coordinator | Resulted in: December 6, 2022 BOS batch approval

Feature	2022 RFA	2023 RFP	Assessment
Document length	25 pages with 7 required attachments	9 pages, no required attachment forms	RFA far more rigorous
Scoring rubric	100-point rubric: Proposed Plan (25), Narrative (25), Budget Worksheet (30), Budget Narrative (20) — each with sub-scores	Four unlisted criteria (qualifications, approach, experience, costs) — NO point weights, NO sub-scores	RFP unauditable
Budget requirements	7 itemized categories (personnel, curriculum, group, events, admin, operating, other); FY22/23 and FY23/24 columns; narrative justification required per line	'Transparent fee schedule' — no template, no required categories, no narrative requirement	RFP allows opaque budgets
Participant projections	Required: number of individuals expected to serve, age groups, geographic regions	Not required	RFP creates no accountability baseline
Measurable goals	Required minimum 3 measurable goals; must support pre/post tests for efficacy	Not required	RFP creates no outcome accountability
Perjury certification	Cover sheet: 'I certify under penalty of perjury I have authority to apply'	Not present	RFP has no penalty deterrent
Intent to Apply	Required; only those submitting Intent considered	Not required	RFP lacks formal entry gate
Regulatory citations	Specific: 9 CCR §3740, §3735; footnoted definitions	General program descriptions; no CFR/CCR citations	RFA legally grounded; RFP not
Contract term offered	FY 22/23 (1 year)	Up to 3 years (FY 23/24–25/26)	RFP offered multi-year awards but executed mostly 1-year contracts
MHSA Coordinator	Samantha Schlieter	Eric Jauregui	Change in responsible party between procurement cycles
Process duration	10+ weeks (Feb 16 – Apr 26)	6 weeks (Mar 10 – Apr 20)	RFP timeline compressed; selection in 2 days after review

CRITICAL FINDING — Degraded Procurement

The county demonstrably knew how to run a rigorous, legally grounded procurement process in 2022. The 2023 RFP stripped away every accountability mechanism: scoring rubric, budget templates, perjury certification, participant projections, measurable outcome goals, and regulatory grounding. A county that produced a 25-page RFA with 7 attachments in 2022 had no administrative excuse for the 9-page RFP in 2023. The degraded process produced outcomes — elimination of 4 contractors, expansion of school district contracts — with no auditable evaluation trail.

4B. Critical RFP Timeline Anomalies

RFP Event	Date	Problem
RFP released	March 10, 2023	FY 22/23 contractors (TMS, Lotus, Karuk, Dunamis) were still under active contracts
Proposals due	April 11, 2023 (extended from Mar 27)	Existing contractors notified of replacement process while still performing
Proposal review	April 18, 2023	One week to review all proposals — inadequate for rigorous scoring
Selection notification	April 20, 2023	Two days after review began
Contract start date (promised)	July 1, 2023	All contracts to be processed by June 1, 2023 per RFP timeline
Actual BOS approvals	Sep 2023 – Mar 2024	3 to 9 months after promised start; entirely contrary to RFP's own timeline
SCRC BOS approval	March 12, 2024	9 months after July 1, 2023 start — services rendered uncontracted the entire period

The RFP promised contracts would be processed by June 1, 2023 and start July 1, 2023. None of the resulting contracts received timely BOS approval. The procurement document itself created a commitment the department then ignored entirely.

4C. RFP and Vendor Selection Inconsistencies

CRITICAL — RFP Claim Inconsistency (Same Meeting, Different Worksheets)

March 12, 2024 BOS meeting: SCRC worksheet says 'selected based on their response to the BHS RFP as well as for the specialized services provided.' NVCSS worksheet (same meeting, same Collard submission) says only 'selected for specialized services provided' — no RFP reference. Two contracts submitted simultaneously by the same person carry different vendor selection justifications. Either NVCSS was not subject to the RFP process (raising separate procurement questions for a $1.93M CSS contract), or the RFP language was inserted into the SCRC worksheet as a retroactive justification.

December 6, 2022 vendor selection (all seven worksheets): Identical language — 'This vendor was selected for specialized services provided.' No RFP or RFA reference in any 2022 worksheet, even though the 2022 RFA process had concluded months earlier. The 2022 RFA process is undocumented in the BOS approval submissions.

All 2023 RFP responses, evaluation scoring records, and April 20, 2023 selection notification letters must be produced. These are the evidentiary foundation for why TMS, Lotus, Karuk, and Dunamis lost FY 23/24 contracts and why the replacement allocations were set at their specific levels.

Section 5: BOS Approval History and Governance Collapse

5A. December 6, 2022 — Batch Approval Meeting (Meeting 417310)

Seven PEI contracts approved on consent agenda. Unanimous 5-0 vote. No discussion, no staff presentation, no supervisor questions per BOS minutes.

Contractor	Amount	Meeting Item	Worksheet Submitter	Program Description in Worksheet
SCRC	$404,600	K	Sarah Collard, Ph.D.	Prevention/outreach, 7 communities: Yreka/Montague/ Weed/Mt.Shasta/Dunsmuir/McCloud/Scott Valley. Linkage, stigma reduction, group sessions for at-risk families/youth
HCCA	$103,900	M	Sarah Collard, Ph.D.	PEI for at-risk populations; stigma/discrimination reduction; Center for Healthy Minds curriculum for youth emotional regulation
Etna PAL	$94,000	L	Sarah Collard, Ph.D.	Youth mentoring, Scott Valley; youth at risk of school failure, JJ involvement, or MH/SUD challenges; referral for additional screening
YES	$112,130	S	Sarah Collard, Ph.D.	Intervention/outreach; linkage to MH providers; stigma reduction presentations; group sessions for underserved/unserved communities
TMS	$144,537	P	Sarah Collard, Ph.D.	PEI services, Merrill/Malin/Tulelake/Dorris communities
Lotus	$77,800	O	Sarah Collard, Ph.D.	Mental Health First Aid (MHFA) and Suicide Prevention trainings specifically
Karuk	$73,395	N	Sarah Collard, Ph.D.	PEI/outreach to Karuk tribal members; linkage to MH providers; group sessions for underserved/unserved communities

Total approved December 6, 2022: $1,110,262. All vendor selection fields: 'This vendor was selected for specialized services provided.' All originals directed to R. Bullock, 818 Main St.

GOVERNANCE NOTE — Consent Agenda with No Narrative Scrutiny

The BOS minutes confirm unanimous approval with zero discussion. No supervisor asked about program scope, participant targets, vendor selection rationale, or geographic coverage. The worksheets submitted by Collard are the only written justification on record for $1.1M in MHSA spending commitments. No competing bids were described, no performance history was cited, and the vendor selection field — a required form field — was answered identically for all seven contracts with a circular non-answer.

5B. March 12, 2024 — Mass Ratification Meeting (Meeting 465562/467766)

Six Behavioral Health contracts approved/ratified on consent agenda. Unanimous vote. No discussion per BOS minutes.

Contractor	Amount	Fund Code	Start Date	BOS Date	Uncontracted Period	Notes
SCRC	$155,000	2129/401031/723000/164	Jul 1, 2023	Mar 12, 2024	~9 months	PEI; 62% cut from FY22/23; worksheet claims RFP selection
Compassion Pathway BH LLC	Unknown	Unknown	Nov 1, 2023	Mar 12, 2024	RATIFIED	Explicit retroactive ratification in minutes
Crisis Support Services of Alameda Co.	Unknown	Unknown	Jul 1, 2023	Mar 12, 2024	~9 months	
Kings View Professional	Unknown	Unknown	Jul 1, 2023	Mar 12, 2024	~9 months	
NVCSS	$1,926,137	2129/401031/723000/163/163A	Jul 1, 2023	Mar 12, 2024	~9 months	CSS not PEI; Six Stones Wellness Center; 3-year term through Jun 2026
CalMHSA	Unknown	Unknown	Jul 1, 2023	Mar 12, 2024	~9 months	Term through Mar 20, 2029

CRITICAL FINDING — Department-Wide Governance Failure

SCRC was not an isolated late approval. On March 12, 2024, Collard's department brought six Behavioral Health contracts to the BOS simultaneously — all with July 1, 2023 start dates, all 9 months into the fiscal year, and at least one (Compassion Pathway) explicitly described as a ratification of services already rendered. The BOS approved all six on consent with no discussion. The Board was never told that services had been running for nine months without contracts. This is a department-wide governance pattern, not an isolated clerical delay.

Additional: Closed session at same March 12, 2024 meeting included wrongful termination suit — Jeramie Foster v. Siskiyou County, Case No. 24CV2298. Relevance TBD — if Foster was a Behavioral Health employee terminated during or proximate to this period, connection to investigative context should be explored.

Section 6: Agenda Worksheet Analysis — Collard's Representations to the Board

All agenda worksheets are Collard's direct personal submissions to the BOS, signed under her name and title. They constitute her official representations about program scope, vendor selection, and financial impact. These are not staff summaries — Collard is listed as both Contact Person and Person Appearing on every worksheet.

6A. SCRC Worksheet Comparison — December 6, 2022 vs. March 12, 2024

Field	Dec 6, 2022 (FY 22/23)	Mar 12, 2024 (FY 23/24)	Significance
Amount	$404,600	$155,000	62% cut — not reflected anywhere in worksheet narrative
Program description	'Prevention and outreach services to community members throughout the Yreka, Montague, Weed, Mt. Shasta, Dunsmuir, McCloud and Scott Valley communities. Services include linkage to appropriate mental health providers, stigma and discrimination reduction presentations, and group sessions targeted to at-risk families and/or youth.'	IDENTICAL TEXT — word for word, including same 7 communities and same 3 service types	Same description used for 62% less money; either program scope was unchanged (cut is unjustified) or program was reduced (description is false)
Vendor selection	'This vendor was selected for specialized services provided.'	'This vendor was selected based on their response to the BHS RFP as well as for the specialized services provided.'	RFP claim newly added in 2024; 2022 worksheet made no reference to RFA despite that process occurring. RFP claim must be verified against RFP records
Gap acknowledgment	N/A	None — no mention that contract period Jul 1, 2023–Jun 30, 2024 is 9 months elapsed	Board was not informed services ran uncontracted July 2023–March 2024
Return address	R. Bullock, 818 Main St	R. Bullock, 818 Main St	Bullock confirmed as contract administrator across both fiscal years and both meetings

6B. December 6, 2022 Worksheet Pattern — All Seven Contractors

Every December 6, 2022 worksheet follows an identical pattern:

- Contact Person: Sarah Collard, Ph.D. / Health & Human Services Agency – Behavioral Health Division
- Person Appearing: Sarah Collard, Ph.D. / Director of Health & Human Services
- Vendor selection: 'This vendor was selected for specialized services provided.' (word-for-word identical, all seven)

- Return address: R. Bullock at 818 Main St (all seven)
- No reference to 2022 RFA process despite process having concluded months earlier

Program descriptions in December 2022 worksheets that are now evidentiary:

Contractor	Key Language from Worksheet — Now Evidentiary
Lotus	'provide Mental Health First Aid (MHFA) and Suicide Prevention trainings' — specific program type. Disappeared FY23/24 with no documented reason despite specific, named service gap created by removal.
TMS	'provide Prevention and Early Intervention services in the Merrill, Malin, Tulelake and Dorris communities' — specific geographic communities. Disappeared FY23/24; those communities' coverage status unknown.
HCCA	'curriculum from the Center for Healthy Minds will be utilized to train at risk youth to improve emotional regulation' — named evidence-based curriculum. Raises question of whether RFP's evidence-based requirement was evaluated for this specific curriculum in FY23/24 renewal.
Etna PAL	'youth in the Scott Valley area who are at risk of school failure, juvenile justice involvement or other challenges... engaging youth in positive activities where they can be referred for additional screening' — specific target population and referral mechanism. 68% cut FY23/24.

Section 7: Documented Anomalies — Full Catalog

Anomalies are numbered sequentially. A1–A6 relate to Dunamis. A7–A12 are systemic anomalies across the full contractor landscape.

#	Anomaly	Description	Significance	Source Tags
A1	Dunamis FY 21/22 Black Hole	$285,000 contracted; $0.00 reported in ARER FY 21/22 for Dunamis	CRITICAL — one of three possible explanations: (1) services never rendered (payment without services), (2) funds diverted, (3) ARER data fabricated. None innocent.	T5-CON-DUN-2122
A2	Dunamis ARER Categorization Mismatch	Contract describes integrated school-based program; FY22/23 ARER splits into two 'Standalone' programs at amounts not matching contract line items	Source data for split never produced; creates data integrity question for all ARER figures	T5-CON-DUN-2122
A3	Dunamis Deliverables Not Verified	Contract requires semester reports, CANS data, pre/post surveys, sign-in sheets. No evidence these were audited or produced	Required for ARER participant counts; absence means participant numbers may be fabricated	T5-CON-DUN-2122
A4	Dunamis Per-Session Payment Structure	Compensation set by session type not participants, enabling participant count manipulation	Same structure in SCRC contract — systemic vulnerability across multiple contractors	T5-CON-DUN-2122, T5-CON-SCRC-2223
A5	Dunamis Disappearance FY 23/24	No renewal, no addendum, no termination, no explanation in any BOS agenda or contract record	Complete evidentiary absence; fund code allocation redirected to YHS/SUHSD without documentation	None found
A6	No BOS Record of Dunamis Resolution	FY22/23 contract shows Dunamis working year 2; FY23/24 shows nothing. No BOS vote ever documented ending the relationship	Governance gap — no documented exit from any $285K/year ongoing contractor	None found
A7	TEACH and YES Cuts (33% and 46%)	TEACH: $164,928 → $110,000 (−$54,928). YES: $112,130 → $60,000 (−$52,130). Both retained but severely cut	Binary: either prior-year payments were inflated, or current-year funding is below MHSA-required levels. Either contradicts Collard's certifications	T5-WS-YES-2223, T5-WS-TEACH-2223, T5-CON-TEACH-2324, T5-CON-YES-2324

#	Anomaly	Description	Significance	Source Tags
A8	SCRC Uncontracted Service Period	Exhibit A dated 02/14/2024; BOS approved 03/12/2024; contract runs from 07/01/2023. 8.5 months of services without BOS authorization	Gov. Code §25300 violation. Any services/payments July 2023–March 2024 had no legal authorization. Retroactive ratification without disclosure to Board	T5-WS-SCRC-2324, T5-CON-SCRC-2324
A9	62% SCRC Cut with Identical Program Description	$404,600 → $155,000 (−62%) but March 2024 worksheet uses word-for-word identical program description as December 2022	Either: (a) Program scope unchanged, so cut is arbitrary/punitive; or (b) Program scope reduced, so description is a false representation to the Board	T5-WS-SCRC-2223, T5-WS-SCRC-2324
A10	School-Based Fund Code Substitution	Dunamis ($285K, evidence-based Botvin LifeSkills) replaced by YHS+SUHSD ($450K) on identical fund code. Net school allocation unchanged	Active programmatic decision with no BOS agenda item, no documented Dunamis performance evaluation, no public explanation	T5-CON-DUN-2122, T5-CON-YHS-2324, T5-CON-SUHSD-2324
A11	Department-Wide Governance Collapse FY23/24	FY22/23: 7 PEI contracts in 1 batch meeting. FY23/24: 0 batch; scattered across 6 BOS meetings 3–9 months late. March 12, 2024: 6 contracts approved simultaneously, all 9 months uncontracted, one explicitly ratified	Not an isolated delay — department-wide systemic failure in contract administration	T6-MIN-031224
A12	RFP Claim Inconsistency (Same Meeting)	SCRC Mar 2024 worksheet claims 'BHS RFP' selection; NVCSS Mar 2024 worksheet (same Collard submission, same meeting) uses only 'specialized services' with no RFP reference	Either NVCSS bypassed competitive procurement for a $1.93M contract, or RFP language was retroactively inserted into SCRC worksheet as post-hoc justification	T5-WS-SCRC-2324, T5-WS-NVCSS-2324
A13	2023 RFP Notification — Disappeared Contractors	No BOS agenda, no public record, no meeting minutes document why TMS ($144,537), Lotus ($77,800), Karuk ($73,395), and Dunamis ($285,000) received no FY23/24 contracts	Either they were excluded from RFP distribution (improper), did not respond (documented in RFP records), or were scored lower (requires production of evaluation records)	T5-RFP-2324 (evaluation records outstanding)

Section 8: Key Persons — Roles and Evidentiary Exposure

Person	Role	Documents Bearing Their Name	Evidentiary Significance
Sarah Collard, Ph.D.	Director of Health & Human Services; MHSA program authority	All 8 confirmed agenda worksheets (Dec 6 2022 ×7; Mar 12 2024 ×1 SCRC; plus NVCSS). All BOS recommended motions.	Personally submitted every worksheet. Personal attestation to program descriptions, vendor selection justifications, and financial amounts for every contract across both fiscal years. Cannot claim administrative distance.
R. (Rose) Bullock	Administrative recipient of all executed contracts; ARER preparer	'Please return 1 original to R. Bullock at 818 Main St' appears on all 8 worksheets (both years, both meetings)	Hub linking procurement approval, contract execution, and ARER outcome reporting. Same person processed incoming contracts and prepared the report that measured their results. Single point of control across the entire PEI accountability chain.
Eric Jauregui	MHSA Coordinator FY 23/24; ran 2023 RFP process	Named as sole contact on 2023 RFP (ejauregui@co.siskiyou.ca.us); not on any 2022 documents	Ran the competitive process that eliminated TMS, Lotus, Karuk, and Dunamis. Responsible for RFP distribution, Q&A forum, proposal review (April 18), and selection notification (April 20). Must produce RFP distribution list, proposal responses, scoring sheets, and selection letters.
Samantha Schlieter	MHSA Coordinator FY 22/23; ran 2022 RFA process	Named as sole contact on 2022 RFA (sschlieter@co.siskiyou.ca.us); not on 2023 documents	Ran the rigorous 25-page RFA process with 100-point rubric. Her departure/role change between the two processes is notable — the procurement quality degraded significantly when Jauregui became coordinator.
Jeramie Foster	Plaintiff, wrongful termination suit	Jeramie Foster v. Siskiyou County, Case No. 24CV2298 — closed session, March 12, 2024 BOS meeting	Relevance TBD. Suit filed contemporaneously with mass contract ratification meeting. If Foster was a Behavioral Health employee, connection to investigative period should be explored.

Section 9: Deposition Question Sequences

Each sequence is designed to establish documentary foundation before demanding explanation. Questions should be asked in order — each answer forecloses the next defensive move.

Sequence 10 — Full PEI Contractor Landscape

1. In FY 22/23, seven PEI contracts were approved at a single BOS meeting on December 6, 2022 — correct?
2. You personally submitted the agenda worksheet for each of those seven contracts, with your name as Contact Person and Person Appearing — correct?
3. In each of those worksheets, the vendor selection explanation was: 'This vendor was selected for specialized services provided' — is that your language?
4. For TMS ($144,537), Lotus ($77,800), Karuk ($73,395), and Dunamis ($285,000): none of these contractors received FY 23/24 contracts. What documentation exists of any BOS vote, addendum, or formal decision to end those relationships?
5. Was there a written performance evaluation of TMS before the decision not to renew? Please produce it.
6. Was there a written performance evaluation of Lotus before the decision not to renew? Given that Lotus specifically provided MHFA and Suicide Prevention trainings — a specific, named service type — what happened to that service gap?
7. Was there a written performance evaluation of Karuk before the decision not to renew? Karuk served tribal members in the Karuk ancestral territory — what entity replaced that coverage?
8. The 2023 RFP was issued March 10, 2023, while TMS, Lotus, Karuk, and Dunamis were still performing under their FY 22/23 contracts. Were those contractors notified? Were they sent the RFP?
9. The RFP promised selection notification by April 20, 2023, contracts processed by June 1, 2023, and a July 1, 2023 start. SCRC was not BOS-approved until March 12, 2024. Explain the nine-month gap between your RFP's promised timeline and the actual BOS approval.
10. Were any invoices paid to SCRC for services between July 1, 2023 and March 12, 2024? Under what legal authority?
11. Dunamis's $285,000 annual allocation was replaced by YHS ($300,000) and SUHSD ($150,000) on the same fund code. That is a vendor substitution, not a budget reduction — the allocation held constant. Was the BOS ever informed of this substitution? Was the Three-Year Plan amended to reflect the change in service delivery model?
12. The 2023 RFP states contracts would be awarded for up to three years (FY 23/24–25/26). SCRC received a one-year contract. Why was SCRC not given the three-year term the RFP described?
13. Please produce: (a) all proposals submitted in response to RFP #BHS-23-002, (b) evaluation scoring sheets from April 18, 2023, (c) selection notification letters dated April 20, 2023, (d) the RFP distribution list showing which organizations received the RFP.

Sequence 11 — Agenda Worksheet Confrontation (SCRC Comparison)

14. I am showing you Exhibit T5-WS-SCRC-2223, the agenda worksheet you submitted for the December 6, 2022 BOS meeting, Item K. You submitted this? [confirm]
15. The vendor selection field states: 'This vendor was selected for specialized services provided.' That was your complete explanation to the Board for selecting SCRC for a $404,600 contract?
16. Now I am showing you Exhibit T5-WS-SCRC-2324, the worksheet you submitted for the March 12, 2024 BOS meeting. The program description is word-for-word identical to the 2022 worksheet — same seven communities, same three service types. Do you see that?
17. If the program description is identical, why was the contract amount 62% lower — $155,000 versus $404,600?
18. If the program scope was reduced to match the lower funding, why does the worksheet say the same thing?

19. The March 2024 worksheet describes a contract for July 1, 2023 to June 30, 2024. You submitted this worksheet on March 12, 2024. That means the contract period was nearly three-quarters elapsed when you sought Board approval. Where in this worksheet is that disclosed to the Board?
20. The March 2024 worksheet says SCRC was selected 'based on their response to the BHS RFP.' The December 2022 worksheet makes no reference to the 2022 RFA despite that process occurring. Why?
21. The NVCSS worksheet submitted at the same March 12, 2024 meeting — by you — uses only 'selected for specialized services provided' with no RFP reference. Was NVCSS subject to a competitive procurement process?
22. Both worksheets list 'Please return 1 original to R. Bullock at 818 Main St.' Ms. Bullock is also named as a preparer of the FY 22/23 ARER. Was Ms. Bullock responsible for tracking contract performance as well as preparing outcome reports?

Sequence 12 — RFA vs. RFP Procurement Degradation

23. The 2022 RFA — Exhibit T5-RFA-2223 — is 25 pages with seven required attachments including a Cover Sheet signed under penalty of perjury. You are familiar with this document?
24. The 2022 RFA required applicants to provide minimum three measurable goals that would serve as the basis for pre/post outcome tests. Were those goals ever collected from the December 2022 contractors?
25. The 2022 RFA had a 100-point scoring rubric with specific sub-scores for Proposed Plan, Plan Narrative, Budget Worksheet, and Budget Narrative. Who scored the FY 22/23 applications? Please produce those scoring sheets.
26. The 2023 RFP — Exhibit T5-RFP-2324 — is 9 pages. It has no required attachment forms, no point-weighted scoring rubric, no required participant projections, no measurable goal requirement, and no perjury certification. Why was the procurement process significantly less rigorous in 2023?
27. The 2022 RFA was run by Samantha Schlieter. The 2023 RFP was run by Eric Jauregui. Did you direct either coordinator to design the process? Did you approve the 2023 RFP before release?
28. The 2023 RFP listed four unweighted evaluation criteria. Who sat on the selection committee? What did each member score each proposal? Why was selection notification issued April 20 — only two days after the April 18 review date?
29. The 2023 RFP promised contracts would be 'processed' by June 1, 2023. Not one FY 23/24 PEI contract received BOS approval before September 2023, and SCRC was not approved until March 2024. Who is responsible for that failure to comply with your own RFP timeline?

Section 10: Document Registry — Full Catalog with Tier Designations

T5 = Contract Evidence (deposition-critical). T5-A = highest priority for deposition. T5-B = pattern evidence. T5-C = historical baseline. T6 = Governance/procedural records.

Tag	Document	Amount	Status	Tier	Priority Notes
T5-WS-SCRC-2223	BOS Agenda Worksheet, SCRC FY 22/23, Dec 6 2022	$404,600	IN HAND	T5-A	Collard's personal submission; baseline for 62% cut comparison; establishes program description that was copied verbatim to 2024 worksheet
T5-WS-SCRC-2324	BOS Agenda Worksheet, SCRC FY 23/24, Mar 12 2024	$155,000	IN HAND	T5-A	Contains RFP claim; identical program description; no gap disclosure. Primary comparison document for Sequence 11
T5-WS-TMS-2223	BOS Agenda Worksheet, TMS FY 22/23, Dec 6 2022	$144,537	IN HAND	T5-A	Confirms amount; Collard-signed; establishes Merrill/ Malin/Tulelake/Dorris coverage now absent FY23/24
T5-WS-YES-2223	BOS Agenda Worksheet, YES FY 22/23, Dec 6 2022	$112,130	IN HAND	T5-A	Confirms amount; establishes baseline for 46% cut
T5-WS-LOTUS-2223	BOS Agenda Worksheet, Lotus FY 22/23, Dec 6 2022	$77,800	IN HAND	T5-A	Confirms amount; specifically identifies MHFA and Suicide Prevention trainings — named service gap created by Lotus disappearance
T5-WS-KARUK-2223	BOS Agenda Worksheet, Karuk FY 22/23, Dec 6 2022	$73,395	IN HAND	T5-A	Confirms amount; tribal-specific coverage now absent
T5-WS-HCCA-2223	BOS Agenda Worksheet, HCCA FY 22/23, Dec 6 2022	$103,900	IN HAND	T5-B	Names Center for Healthy Minds curriculum; establishes baseline for 11% increase
T5-WS-ETNAPAL-2223	BOS Agenda Worksheet, Etna PAL FY 22/23, Dec 6 2022	$94,000	IN HAND	T5-B	At-risk youth, school failure/ JJ risk; baseline for 68% cut

Tag	Document	Amount	Status	Tier	Priority Notes
T5-WS-NVCSS-2324	BOS Agenda Worksheet, NVCSS FY 23/24, Mar 12 2024	$1,926,137	IN HAND	T5-A	CSS not PEI; no RFP claim despite same-day SCRC claiming RFP; R. Bullock recipient; Activity 163/163A confirmed
T5-CON-SCRC-2324	Contract + Exhibit A, SCRC FY 23/24	$155,000	IN HAND	T5-A	Exhibit A dated 02/14/2024; BOS 03/12/2024; Apricot payment condition; confirms fund code
T5-CON-SCRC-2223	Contract, SCRC FY 22/23	$404,600	IN HAND	T5-A	Comparator for 62% cut; per-session payment structure
T5-CON-TEACH-2324	Contract + Exhibit A, TEACH FY 23/24	$110,000	IN HAND	T5-B	33% cut confirmed
T5-CON-TEACH-2223	Contract, TEACH FY 22/23	$164,928	IN HAND	T5-B	Baseline for 33% cut
T5-CON-YES-2324	Contract + Exhibit A, YES FY 23/24	$60,000	IN HAND	T5-B	46% cut confirmed
T5-CON-HCCA-2324	Contract + Exhibit A, HCCA FY 23/24	$115,000	IN HAND	T5-B	11% increase
T5-CON-SUHSD-2324	Contract + Exhibit A, SUHSD FY 23/24	$150,000	IN HAND	T5-B	New contractor; school-based fund code
T5-CON-DUN-2122	Contract, Dunamis FY 21/22–22/23	$285,000/yr	IN HAND	T5-A	School-based; Botvin LifeSkills; fund code matches YHS/SUHSD; FY21/22 unreported in ARER
T5-CON-YHS-2324	Contract + Addendum, YHS FY 23/24	$300,000 total	IN HAND	T5-A	Same fund code as Dunamis; school-based substitution; addendum $150K approved ~Oct 2024
T5-RFA-2223	2022 RFA (25 pages, 7 attachments)	N/A	IN HAND (web)	T5-A	25-page rigorous procurement; 100-pt rubric; Contact: Schlieter. Contrast with 2023 RFP for Sequence 12
T5-RFP-2324	2023 RFP #BHS-23-002 (9 pages)	N/A	IN HAND (web)	T5-A	Stripped-down procurement; no rubric; Contact: Jauregui. Missing: proposal responses, scoring sheets, selection letters, distribution list
T6-MIN-120622	BOS Minutes, Dec 6, 2022	N/A	IN HAND	T6	Confirms 7 PEI contracts on consent agenda; unanimous 5-0; no discussion

Tag	Document	Amount	Status	Tier	Priority Notes
T6-MIN-031224	BOS Minutes, Mar 12, 2024	N/A	IN HAND	T6	Confirms 6 BH contracts on consent; Compassion Pathway explicitly ratified; Foster wrongful termination closed session
T5-RFP-RESPONSES	All proposals submitted to 2023 RFP	N/A	OUTSTANDING	T5-A	Must be subpoenaed; will show who responded and who did not (TMS/Lotus/Karuk/Dunamis)
T5-RFP-SCORING	April 18 2023 evaluation scoring sheets	N/A	OUTSTANDING	T5-A	Must be produced; only auditable record of selection decisions
T5-RFP-SELECTION	April 20 2023 selection notification letters	N/A	OUTSTANDING	T5-A	Must be produced; confirms who was notified of award/non-award
T5-RFP-DISTLIST	RFP distribution list	N/A	OUTSTANDING	T5-A	Must be produced; confirms whether TMS/Lotus/Karuk/Dunamis were invited to compete
T5-CON-ETNAPAL-2223	Contract, Etna PAL FY 22/23	$94,000	IN HAND	T5-B	Needed to confirm amount and service description; baseline for 68% cut
T5-CON-HCCA-2223	Contract, HCCA FY 22/23	$103,900	IN HAND	T5-B	Amount confirmed by worksheet; contract needed for service terms comparison
T5-CON-YHS-2223	Contract, YHS FY 22/23	$180,700	IN HAND	T5-B	Fund code substitution baseline

Section 11: Outstanding Investigative Questions

#	Question	Priority	Action Required
Q1	RESOLVED — All FY 23/24 NTE amounts confirmed via Exhibit A	RESOLVED	None
Q2	RESOLVED — TMS, Lotus, Karuk, Dunamis FY22/23 amounts confirmed via Collard's own Dec 6 2022 worksheets	RESOLVED	None
Q3	Were TMS, Lotus, Karuk, and Dunamis invited to respond to the 2023 RFP? Did they respond?	CRITICAL	Subpoena RFP distribution list and all proposal responses
Q4	Do evaluation scoring sheets from April 18, 2023 exist? Who scored the proposals?	CRITICAL	Subpoena via Jauregui; if destroyed, raises separate spoliation issue
Q5	Were invoices paid to SCRC (and other contractors) during the July 2023–March 2024 uncontracted period?	CRITICAL	Accounts payable records; Apricot system payment logs per SCRC Exhibit A payment condition
Q6	Was NVCSS subject to competitive procurement? No RFP reference in its Mar 2024 worksheet	HIGH	Produce NVCSS procurement documentation; compare to SCRC RFP claim
Q7	What were Dunamis's semester reports, CANS data, pre/post surveys for FY 21/22 and FY 22/23?	HIGH	Subpoena from Dunamis and from County records; if none exist, invoices were paid without deliverables
Q8	What is the complete FY 21/22 PEI contractor list (meeting 405647)? Was Dunamis the only school-based contractor that year?	HIGH	BOS archive direct access or public records request
Q9	Why was Etna PAL cut 68% ($94K → $30,215)? What program evaluation supported this?	MEDIUM	Document request; deposition question for Collard
Q10	What is Jeramie Foster's role? Was Foster a Behavioral Health employee? Is Case No. 24CV2298 related?	MEDIUM	Court docket search; if BH employee, explore temporal connection to investigation period
Q11	Were any Medi-Cal cost reports filed for FY 22/23? (Highest priority per Legal Memo Section VI)	CRITICAL	DHCS records request; resolves federal vs. state claims question
Q12	The RFP promised 3-year contracts; SCRC got 1 year. Were other contractors given 3-year terms? Why not SCRC?	MEDIUM	Compare all FY23/24 contract terms; deposition question

Section 12: Methodological Note and Source Quality

This analysis is based on the following source categories, in descending order of evidentiary weight:

- PRIMARY (highest): Collard's own BOS agenda worksheets, signed under her name with personal attestation — 8 confirmed worksheets across 2 meetings. These are Collard's direct representations to the Board and cannot be repudiated as hearsay or summary.
- PRIMARY: Exhibit A documents attached to contracts, providing confirmed NTE amounts in Collard's department's own contract documents.
- PRIMARY: BOS minutes from December 6, 2022 and March 12, 2024 — official governmental records of what was (and was not) disclosed to the Board.
- PRIMARY: 2022 RFA and 2023 RFP — publicly posted procurement documents establishing the rules each competitive process operated under.
- SECONDARY: BOS agenda HTML pages and contract PDFs from bosagenda.co.siskiyou.ca.us. JavaScript rendering limits on the BOS agenda system mean some meeting details required Google search indexing.

Meeting 405647 (FY 21/22 batch) was not directly accessible, meaning the complete FY 21/22 PEI contractor list (beyond Dunamis) remains unconfirmed. All other amounts and contractual terms cited in this document are confirmed from primary sources.

Document Version

Version 3 | Updated February 2026 | Adds: all Dec 6 2022 and Mar 12 2024 agenda worksheet findings; 2022 RFA vs 2023 RFP comparative analysis; complete key persons section (Jauregui, Schlieter, Bullock); Sequences 11 and 12; expanded anomaly catalog (A7–A13); full document registry with tier designations; NVCSS fund code confirmation.